

THE INDUSTRIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST (TIP)

The *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist* is published four times yearly (February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1) by the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association. The editorial office is located at the School of Management, SUNY-Binghamton, Binghamton, NY 13901. Published by the Ceryoga Press, Inc., Ithaca, NY. Inquiries regarding advertising should be directed to M. J. Kavanagh, School of Management, SUNY-Binghamton, Binghamton, NY 13901.

Address changes should be directed to APA Circulation Offices, 1200 Seventeenth St., N. W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Subscriptions are included with membership in the Division. TIP circulation is approximately 3000 which includes the membership of the Division, leaders in the industrial and academic communities, APA officers and board members, presidents of APA divisions, Editors of APA newsletters, graduate students in industrial-organizational psychology, and to libraries and graduate schools.

Opinions expressed are those of the writers and do not necessarily reflect the official positions of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology unless so stated.

M.J. Kavanagh Editor
Marshall Sashkin Associate Editor
Jack Duffy Assistant Editor and Business Manager

Topical Editors
Tove Hammer **Jim Sharf**
Gary Latham **Lynn Plumlee**

President
John Campbell
 Psychology Department
 University of Minnesota
 Minneapolis, MN 55455

Secretary-Treasurer
Mary L. Tenopyr
 A T & T
 295 N. Maple Ave.,
 Room 6126G2
 Basking Ridge, N.J. 07920

TABLE OF CONTENTS

President's Message	2
Guest Editorial	4
LRP Report	6
New Coalition?	9
In-Basket TIPBITS	12
Clearinghouse	15
Journal Review Service	17
Workshops	19
Uniform Guidelines	28
Legislative Concerns	30
Position Openings	36



ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR AND PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY

Kenneth N. Wexley, *University of Akron*, and (paperbound)
Gary A. Yukl, *State University of New York at Albany*

Combining the most important topics from organizational behavior as well as personnel psychology, this text shows the practical implications of theory for improving work behavior. 1977

PERSPECTIVES ON PERSONNEL/HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (paperbound)

Edited by **Herbert G. Heneman, III** and **Donald P. Schwab**,
both of the University of Wisconsin, Madison

A supplement for introductory courses in personnel management, human resources, industrial relations, and industrial psychology, this is a book of readings with extensive commentary by the editors.

Just Published

HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT: A Behavioral Systems Approach

Lawrence A. Klatt, **Robert G. Murdick** and **Fred E. Schuster**,
all of Florida Atlantic University

Designed for a comprehensive basic course in Human Resources Management, this book provides a basis for broadening the appeal and scope of the traditional introductory personnel course. *Just Published*

Examination copies for adoption consideration available on request. Please indicate course title and text presently used.

RICHARD D. IRWIN, INC.
 Homewood, Illinois 60430

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

John P. Campbell

This is entirely about professional affairs, although I hope we can remember that we are scientists as well as practitioners. Last summer, before starting my tenure as president of the division, I naively assumed that the real fights over licensure, continuing education, accreditation of graduate programs, and APA reorganization would not occur for 3-5 more years. That prediction was painfully incorrect. A number of issues are currently in the critical stage and I believe that in 0.5-2.5 years they will have all been decided, one way or another. The issues in question are primarily "professional" and not scientific. As Art Mackinney notes in his guest editorial for this issue, the professional issues are being forced upon us and they are taking up a lot of time. I will try to summarize what's involved for Division 14. These are strictly my own opinions.

Two groups are currently proposing criteria for the accreditation of doctoral (Ph.D. or Psy.D.) programs in professional psychology and there seems to be an undercurrent of conflict between them. One group is the E&T Board's Task Force on Accreditation, which is seeking to revise the 1973 criteria for accreditation of Ph.D. programs in clinical, counseling, and school psychology. One feature of their current draft is the broadening of the definition of professional programs to include I/O psychology. Thus, if for some reason we wanted to accredit one or more I/O programs (APA accreditation is voluntary) and the proposed criteria were applied, an accredited I/O program would have to have a supervised practicum *and* a formal internship, etc.. That is, accreditation would require us to do many things which we typically do not now do. A second avenue of accreditation is being pushed by a consortium of several groups and is not really APA-sponsored. The effort was begun by an alliance of the American Association of State Psychology Boards and the National Register for Health Service Providers and the intent is to set up a national accreditation organization independent of APA. This effort was originally stimulated by several successful law suits brought against state examining boards by individuals who had been denied licensure because they were not trained in a doctoral program that was primarily "psychological." In the view of its sponsors a nationally recognized accreditation agency could prevent such individuals from having grounds for a suit, and thus "keep them out." At this point one might ask why this should concern I/O psychology, since accreditation is voluntary. Please read on.

Perhaps one of the most controversial documents now circulating is the APA Board of Professional Affairs (BPA) sponsored Model for State Legislation affecting the Practice of Psychology. It is intended to be a very specific set of guidelines for state legislatures to use when writing a licensing law for psychological practice. It strongly advocates that it is job activities and not job titles or educational credentials that should be licensed. Thus, if a management consultant with a Ph.D. from a business school accepted a fee for a service covered by the law, a license would be required. Most of the things that I/O psychologists and other types of consultants in organizational behavior do are included in the Model's definition of professional psychology. In general, the licensing law proposed in this plan is most appropriate for full time health care providers. In my opinion, it would prove very restrictive for almost everyone else. The current draft of the Model has been approved by BPA, which wants to submit it to the APA Board of Directors and APA Council for final approval. The Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) has strong objections to the Model, and during the spring there will be a number of joint BPA/BSA meetings to discuss differences. The most global issue is generic vs. specialty licensing. BPA, which currently speaks primarily for health care providers, wants a generic law. That is, BPA's pre-

ference is for a state to adopt one licensing law that would incorporate one set of requirements and regulations applicable to all professional practitioners. I think most members of BSA, as well as most members of Division 14, would prefer specialty licensing, if licensing is necessary. Without specialty licensing we could be saddled with any number of inappropriate requirements.

The generic vs. specialty issue has also arisen with regard to APA's policy statement on Standards for the Providers of Psychological Services and APA's attempt to develop a formal Continuing Education (CE) capability. The issue in these two domains has essentially already been resolved. Division 14 successfully argued against a generic set of "Standards" and against a generic CE plan. Thanks to good work by the Professional Affairs Committee and the E&T Committee respectively, we proposed our own specialty standards and our own CE plan, and so far the APA decision-making structure is going along with them. I think the strategy must be much the same in the areas of licensure and accreditation.

Again one could ask, why not just ignore all of this? In response, I now propose a theory of dominos. For us to really worry, the first domino that must fall is that states adopt licensing laws covering I/O activities. If such laws require a doctoral degree, continuing education credits, and "standards" of the kinds specified by APA guidelines and policies, then we will have to conform to the kinds of educational and work experiences specified in whatever accreditation criteria, CE plan, and "Standards" are finally adopted. If we don't conform we don't get licensed, and if we don't get licensed we don't practice. Again, for all this to be of real concern, a state must pass a restrictive (from the I/O perspective) licensing law of the type advocated by BPA. This has already happened to some extent in some states (e.g. Maryland). How pervasive it will become in the future is anyone's guess.

How can the Division work to foster policies that are appropriate for our kind of psychological practice, diverse though it is? I think there are three principal strategies. First, we can try to develop a more active voice in APA Council, since that's where final approval for a new policy must be given. As described elsewhere in this issue, we are trying to do that by establishing another coalition within the Council among divisions with interests similar to ours. Second, we can attempt to place members of the Division on key APA boards and committees since that is where policies are formulated and shaped. We have been under represented on such boards and committees in the past but are struggling to change the situation. Third, we can devote a great deal of time to developing our own policy statements to use as a foundation for arguing against a generic point of view. This was successful with respect to Continuing Education and the Standards for Providers of Psychological Services. I think we've learned not to underestimate the "expert power" that accrues to a well worked out position. It is difficult and time consuming task, but I think we must follow the same strategy with regard to the accreditation issue. Historically, the position of the Division has been against the accreditation of I/O programs. However, we may not be able to maintain this position forever.

To conclude, I would offer the opinion that issues such as the above are creating an ever widening split between the health care practitioners and the academic/scientists. The Board of Scientific Affairs Ad Hoc Subcommittee on APA Organization has just released for discussion its first draft of a reorganization plan. This is the first formal recognition by the American Psychological Association that reorganization may be necessary. So as not to get lost in the shuffle, Division 14 must have its priorities and contingency plans well in hand. The new coalition should greatly aid communication among divisions with common interests. However, the Division 14 Executive Committee also needs as much input as possible from the membership. Let us hear from you. (John's address is on the inside front cover.)

GUEST EDITORIAL

Is It Time to Bail Out?

by Art MacKinney

What are the chances that Division 14 as we know it will be a part of APA five or ten years from now? A surprising number of our informed and thoughtful members are asking this question and by asking it reveal an increasingly pessimistic view of our future as a part of APA. Those of us holding elected offices in the Division have the responsibility to think through various possible futures for the Division — including the doomsday one implied by my opening question — and lay out contingency plans for each.

I am genuinely concerned that circumstances beyond our control may have the effect of forcing us out of APA. Not everyone agrees with such a pessimistic reading of the future, but recent events are of a kind and magnitude that makes such a doomsday prediction at least possible. As such, it behooves all of us to examine whether we agree with it, whether we care, whether we want to reverse the trend, what alternatives to APA might exist, and so forth.

At the base of most of the problems I allude to here is the very strong drive among the health-care-oriented members of APA to guarantee what they will continue to be licensable, accreditable, and payable by health insurers. I don't imply nefarious motives at all. Clinicians are not evil people. Rather they are so anxious to protect their own interests that they forget that professional practice is not synonymous with clinical practice. The policies and procedures they generate are not always appropriate and often appear harmful to nonclinical practitioners.

Division 14's identification with the scientist-professional model is well known to all of you; while we may not have invented it, we certainly epitomize it. At the same time we venerate it and regard it's continuation as important to American psychology. The modern press in APA, however, is on the professional-professional model (as taught in the newly emerging professional schools) giving rise to a dichotomization of psychologists as researchers or practitioners, academics or professionals. The I-O psychologist, as we all know, is both researcher and practitioner.

There has been considerable publicity given to the possibilities for reorganization of APA. The report of the Ad hoc Committee On The Organization of APA envisions a four-factor solution: (1) clinical-professional, (2) research, (3) service to agencies, and (4) teaching. Of special import here is the fact that I-O psychology has elements which overlap at least three of the four and thus this APA reorganization concept has the strong potential for splitting Division 14.

Here are other examples:

- In the area of continuing education, it was only by virtue of a strong and sustained effort by our E & T Committee that we were able to avoid being locked into a set of policies and procedures which were designed for clinicians and that simply didn't fit our needs.

- The early drafts of the APA policy documents on standards for providers of service presented policies presumably applicable to all practice. But, as usual, they were written by and for clinicians and failed to take account of other kinds of practice. Again, by virtue of strong protest and speedy work by our Professional Affairs Committee, we seem to have succeeded in getting the basic policies revised and our own standards on record.

- A committee of the APA Board of Professional Affairs has redrafted the APA model legislation. The redraft would, if approved by Council (where clinicians are the dominant voice) define the practice of psychology very broadly and require licensure for activities such as research, teaching, and giving guest lectures. It

would also require licensure for those who practice only within one organization. Many of us question whether this kind of state law would be in the best interest of I-O psychology or the public we serve.

- A committee of the APA Education and Training Board has redrafted the accreditation criteria for doctoral programs. There seems to be a real effort to broaden the APA accreditation to other professional areas (beyond clinical, counseling, and school) and require certain content areas as well as practice and internships. Nothing like this has been endorsed by Division 14.

- A recent conference on education and credentialing — convened by the Association of State Psychology Boards and the Council of the National Register for Health Service Providers in Psychology — have also called for all professional practice education in psychology to include certain prescribed areas of study (e.g., physiological psychology) and internships. This group aims for *required* instead of voluntary accreditation of doctoral programs that is more stringent and more inclusive than APA's.

Perhaps this is sufficient for the point. Life for Division 14 within APA is becoming more difficult and more costly. To protect the self-interest of our profession, we are forced to continuously monitor and fend off the thoughtless incursions of our clinical colleagues. This in turn has caused some to wonder whether we would be better off in an independent association of like-minded psychologists committed to a kind of professional practice that combines the methods of science with organizational problem solving. The implications are enormous; too many for discussion at this time and best left as subjects for future reports. But I invite all members to reflect on such issues as presented above and prepare to enter the discussions and deliberations as the various forums present themselves.

Do Psychologists work with Unions?

by Neal Schmitt

One of the often expressed concerns of some industrial/organizational psychologists is their almost exclusive identification with management personnel and their problems. This usually also means that contacts between union personnel and psychologists have been infrequent and less than totally harmonious. The Committee on Public Policy and Social Issues has discussed this problem and has decided to see if anything can be done to promote greater involvement and/or interaction between psychologists and unions.

Our initial effort in this regard is an attempt to document any recent psychologist-union research or consulting activities. We would like to gather this information for two reasons. First, we feel it would make an informative article in some future issue of *TIP*. Secondly, we think that such information may be useful in more effectively advertising our interest and expertise to union personnel.

If you or one of your colleagues have worked with unions in some consulting, teaching, or research role, we would hope that you would send us a couple of paragraphs describing the nature of the activity. Indicate who was involved (union and psychologists), what the nature of the project was, your evaluation of its success/failure if the project has been completed, problems that may be unique to working with unions, the likelihood that one or both parties will pursue future interaction possibilities, and other suggestions or reactions.

Long Range Planning Committee Report*

by Dick Campbell

The Long Range Planning Committee during 1977-78 is focusing its efforts on determining the major issues facing the division over the next five years, and strategies for dealing with these issues. The deliberations of the committee led to the conclusion that there was one paramount issue impacting the Division now and in the years ahead — **the relationship of the Division with APA.**

The committee decided that in order to determine the proper relationship of the Division with APA, it was necessary to first specify the major values and interests of the membership of Division 14. A number of documents produced by the Division over the years were examined, but primary emphasis was placed on the Long Range Planning Report. These documents were examined for the major themes or values that have been expressed by the various representatives of the Division over the past years. At the risk of over-simplification, one primary factor was found at the core of the membership's interest. **This primary value is our commitment to the scientist-practitioner model.** It was also concluded that it was essential that **Division 14 continue intact.** Whether or not the Division will be affiliated with APA, the primary interest of the membership is the preservation of an organization which included both scientists and practitioners. This does not mean that the Division should not expand, in fact, the long range planning document calls for such expansion, but that the present membership should remain as a core of any future organization.

The rationale for the maintenance and further development of the organization encompasses the following considerations. First and foremost, the scientist-practitioner model is our great strength. In practice, we were the Boulder model before the Boulder Conference. We are the best continuing example of the scientist-practitioner model in psychology.

The thrust of the work of the members of the Division is the study of individual behavior in work situations/organizations. While this may not be unique to members of Division 14, we represent an outstanding example. Our research is problem-oriented as well as theoretical. Our concern is with implementation as well as knowledge and theory.

We feel it is important that at least some of the behavioral scientists practicing in organizations have basic psychological science as part of their core curriculum in graduate school. It is abundantly clear that now and in the future the scientist-practitioner will not be the most frequently-found model of the behavioral scientist working in organizations. However, Division 14 members have, and can continue, to serve as the nucleus group with training in basic psychological science for those working in industry. The training of the industrial/organizational psychologist has provided an excellent bridge between the core curriculum and organizations.

Grandiose as it may sound, we conclude that the scientist-practitioner is vital to society, to APA, to psychology and to the individual members of Division 14. We also conclude that what our membership wants most is the maintenance and furtherance of the scientist-practitioner model, and that this can best be fostered through the continuance of Division 14.

There are a number of forces which threaten the maintenance and furtherance of Division 14. Many of the danger signals have appeared in the form of professional problems. These include accreditation of programs in psychology,

standards for the providers of psychological services (COSPOPS), model guidelines for psychological licensure (COSL), continuing education, legislative-judicial decisions, et cetera. Other danger signals include the swing away from the Boulder model to the Vail model. We are not stating, necessarily, that the Vail model is inappropriate. However, the disappearance of the Boulder model would be a serious loss.

The key danger signal that confronts the Division is the turmoil within APA and the impending reorganization of the national organization. It poses a clear threat to the maintenance of Division 14 which, at the moment, lacks political power to deal very effectively with the direction APA is taking.

Three scenarios were developed to examine the possible impact of APA organizational developments on Division 14. While the number of possibilities are legion, three major scenarios were discussed which mark three points on the continuum of change. The three scenarios are: (1) no change in APA organization over the next five years, (2) a federation of assemblies, and, (3) the exit, voluntarily or by de facto ousting, from APA of Division 14.

We then looked at the potential impact of each scenario on the Division. Under the scenario of no change, a number of problems appear. We are likely to continue to be consumed by professional issues. The state associations and the clinicians will continue to dominate Council and influence legislation that is detrimental to Division 14. One possibility, which we assigned a reasonably high probability, is that the Division 14 membership under this condition would gradually wither away. The difficulty and cost of continuing to call one's self a psychologist would become so onerous that many long term members of Division 14 would pack it in. Other likely homes for those who would leave the Division are ASPA and the Academy of Management.

The federation scenario does not offer much more solace. The major split in APA is between the clinicians or health providers and the scientist/adacademics. While other assemblies could appear in a federation, these are the two dominant ones. Neither group would provide a very satisfactory home for the scientist-practitioner espoused by Division 14. At the present time Division 14 has limited power to influence the direction that an APA federation would take. We could consider joining the academic assembly, but this is not very satisfactory for a number of reasons. Not the least of which is the difficulty that Departments of Psychology would have. Federation does offer some interesting possibilities to Division 14 if the Division can take a pro-active stance and position itself properly in the event of federation. As matters now stand, federation would have a substantial negative impact on our membership.

The third scenario is one in which Division 14 finds itself outside of APA at some future date. Some members of the LRP think that this situation may be almost inevitable. It is unlikely that Division 14 would voluntarily decide to leave. Nor do we anticipate being directly ousted from APA. However, there is the strong possibility that we will be faced with a de facto ousting because conditions become too onerous for continuance within the APA structure. This scenario does not bode well for Division 14. There is a serious question as to whether or not the Division could survive without the services provided by APA. A look at the cost of maintaining an organization outside of APA suggests that the present dues payments would not be sufficient to cover the administrative requirements, publication of a journal, et cetera. In addition, all of the professional issues that we face today would remain. In fact, they would be aggravated because we would have no voice within APA to effect the mainstream of legislation and regulation influencing psychologists in general.

After review of the scenarios, various strategies were discussed. The best alternative at this time available to Division 14 is to form a coalition with Divisions which share common interests. Good candidates for this coalition are Divisions 5, 8, 13, 17, 19 and 21. It appears, from our analysis, that the coalition would

* Editor's note — Due to its importance as background for Division 14's concern over APA reorganization, the entire LRP committee report from the winter meeting of the Executive Committee is reprinted. Many of the committee's recommendations are already in progress as is obvious from other articles in this issue.

be very useful under all three scenarios. This is a key reason for urging that a coalition be formed and be made functional NOW. (See the coalition reports elsewhere in this issue.)

The advantages of coalition under the no change condition are that we could increase our power within APA to respond to professional issues and also broaden the discipline of industrial/organizational psychology, as espoused in the long range planning document. The increased power would enable us to be more influential regarding professional issues and perhaps share the burden of monitoring the state legislatures and other bodies which influence the practice of psychology.

The coalition would be of obvious utility in a federation scenario. As things now stand most proposals do not include an assembly that would be suitable for I/O psychology. Formation of a coalition of Divisions with common interests would pave the way for the inclusion of an assembly that would meet our needs.

A coalition might also be useful in responding to the doomsday or ousting from APA scenario. The probability of survival with a larger membership body is higher, and we might survive as a psychonomic society or AAAP type organization.

The purposes of the coalition would include communication, professional affairs, administration, and political clout. Communication would include such things as the holding of periodic meetings for the sharing of scientific information, the publication of a journal, and maintenance of a roster of members. The professional purpose would encompass the review of legislation and other activities to protect our common interests. The administrative purpose would be to share the time and cost involved in maintaining the organization. The political purpose would be served mainly by the increase in numbers but buttressed with the knowledge that a broad spectrum of scientist-practitioner type psychologists have banded together to make their voice heard. This political influence would be useful both within and outside of APA.

It is important that a coalition be formed as soon as possible. It also is quite important that this coalition be highly visible, active and publicized. The specific recommendations of the Long Range Planning Committee follow.

The LRP strongly endorses the formation of a Coalition with other Divisions of APA who share common interests with Division 14. It is essential that the Coalition become active and visible as quickly as possible. The Specific recommendations of the LRP are:

1. Division 14 should stimulate a meeting of the leadership of the interested Divisions to discuss the possibilities of merger. In addition, Division 14 should propose the following joint activities:

- a. A joint meeting of the Divisions at the 1978 annual meeting. The format would be along the lines of the Open Forum with representatives of each Division on the podium. A joint social hour should be arranged also.
- b. Publication of a joint newsletter (one issue) to be mailed to members of all Divisions in the Coalition. It would include articles on Council, reasons for forming the Coalition, professional issues we share, and a piece on common methodology.
- c. Prepare an article for MONITOR on formation of the Coalition and its planned activities.
- d. Division 14 should offer appropriate opportunities for the other Divisions to become involved in our Conference on Innovations in Methodology (see report on conference planning in this issue).

2. Division 14 should prepare a roster of consultants (academics and FTT's) to assist psychology departments in designing programs in I/O psychology. This group would be prepared to do such things as: help design curricula, gain access to resources in local industry, help with accreditation problems, and help in funding proposals.

THE START OF SOMETHING?

The letter reprinted below was sent to the designated division presidents in late October of last year. It was the opening step in our attempt to organize a new coalition within APA Council. We hope it proves useful in identifying common interests, speaking with stronger voice, and facilitating inter-divisional communication.

* * * * *

I am writing to the new Presidents of Divisions 5, 8, 13, 17, 19, 21, and 23, to get your reactions to a proposal that I think speaks to our common interests. The Division 14 Executive Committee discussed these issues at APA in San Francisco and the consensus was that I present the following ideas to you.

As we are all aware, these are not the best of times for the solidarity and unity of the American Psychological Association. There is increasing evidence of considerable stress within the organization that may soon alter its structure and change the procedures by which it functions. For example, the legislative activities of the APA Council of Representatives are being increasingly influenced by the existence of three coalitions within the Council (i.e. the research/academic, professional, and public interest groups). Also, there is increasing discussion about transforming APA into a federation of several relatively autonomous societies and the APA Board of Scientific Affairs has gone so far as to appoint an ad hoc subcommittee on APA reorganization. The chairperson of the subcommittee, Dr. Richard Thompson, reflected some of the thinking of the subcommittee in an editorial in the convention issue of the *Monitor*. Finally, Division 31 introduced a resolution at the August meeting suggesting a survey of the membership to determine reactions to dividing APA into three relatively autonomous "assemblies." The motion was deferred until January, but the ball is now rolling. In sum, it seems likely that a reorganization of some sort will occur within the not too distant future and that the current trend is toward a three factor solution.

The purpose of this letter is to suggest that it might be mutually advantageous to form a fourth coalition within the APA Council of Representatives. Our reasons for making such a suggestion are as follows. The apparent movement of APA toward some kind of reorganization based on the three interest groups mentioned above places Division 14, and I would assume other Divisions as well, in a very uncomfortable position. Our membership does not hold exclusively to either a scientific/academic or a professional orientation, although we have lots of academicians, researchers, and practitioners in our midst. In fact, we still take pride in adhering to the combined scientist/practitioner model which says that the scientist and the practitioner can and should exist within one skin. We take it as a source of strength that the delivery of a wide variety of professional services goes hand in hand with data collection, sound measurement, good research design, and the application of theory and knowledge from a broad array of domains in psychology. Thus, one of our foremost self interests is to preserve a place in whatever new form the association takes that would give support to the scientific/professional model. Also, our membership in concerned with a wide variety of practices and professional services that are not easily encompassed by policies pertaining specifically to health care practices. As one of our members said recently, "If the APA pie is divided into the three contemplated assemblies we will be right in the center." Our strong feeling is that while we have interests in all three of the present coalitions, we are under represented by each and perhaps misrepresented by some.

Given the above, I would like to explore your Division's interest in forming a fourth informal coalition within the APA Council of Representatives. This additional coalition would be concerned with both scientific and professional (non-health care related) issues that impact on our common scientific professional concerns. One specific initial purpose of the coalition would be to determine, over the course of several Council meetings, the extent to which a number of Divisions have common interests and positions that could better be served by joint efforts in Council. A second objective of the new coalition would be to explore the feasibility of a fourth assembly, should APA decide at some later date to reorganize into several assemblies. At this point we have no firm notions about whether such an assembly would be a good idea or what form it should take. However, using a new coalition to explore the problem seems worthwhile. In my judgment, the highest priority of the membership of Division 14 is in maintaining an APA in which the scientist/ practitioner model is adequately represented.

One way to begin the process would be to have an exploratory meeting of interested Council Representatives on the Friday evening of the January Council Meeting. The Division 14 representatives would be willing to host this first meeting and to develop an outline of an agenda that could be circulated for pre-meeting comments. Even though this letter is being sent to a limited number of Divisions with whom we think we share significant common interests, the initial meeting would be open to everyone and Council representatives from all Divisions would be invited.

In sum, I think there is much that can be done in anticipation of a possible reorganization of APA, and I hope this proposal stimulates your interest. The immediate questions are whether you respond favorably to the basic idea and whether at least one of your Council Representatives could attend the organizational meeting of the fourth coalition on the evening of Friday, January 27. Given sufficient interest, the coalition can make its formal start at the Toronto Convention. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

John P. Campbell
President, Division 14

ANNOUNCEMENT

The Grey Art Gallery of New York University is planning an exhibit entitled *The Factory Style of Architecture* which will show the interrelationships among architecture, sociology, psychology and economics in the design of factory buildings in the United States since 1850. Included will be paintings, architectural drawings, photographs, and audio visual presentations, with special emphasis on original materials. A catalogue will reproduce some of the exhibits and place them in their historic and social context. The show will tour the country after it appears in New York in the Fall of 1979.

Anyone who has information relating plant architecture to productivity, morale, safety or other psychologically relevant variables, or who wishes to submit or suggest exhibits, is invited to write to **Richard S. Barrett, 5 Riverview Place, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York 10706.**

First Coalition Meeting

by Kitty Katzell

In response to invitations issued by Division 14 President **John Campbell**, fourteen Council representatives from seven divisions attended a meeting in Washington, D.C. on January 27, 1978, to discuss concerns of applied scientist/practitioners in APA that tend not to be heard in Council and other APA forums.

A wide-ranging discussion extending over a period of two hours showed considerable consensus about themes that served to draw together the divisions represented at the meeting chaired by Division 14 Representative **Mike Beer**. The group identified several reactive and proactive issues with which the coalition could identify, recognizing that proactive stands might be taken at times on reactive issues, and vice versa.

Among the *reactive* issues were:

- Credentialing and accreditation, where the divisions represented at the meeting may not have the same urgent needs as those felt by clinicians, but they are affected by Council decisions on the subject;
- Ethical standards, which require extension if they are to be applicable and meaningful to the applied scientist/practitioner working with organizations;
- Public information, which may not meet the needs of applied scientist/practitioners and may even frustrate those needs, while meeting the needs of health care practitioners;
- APA reorganization, which will require applied scientist/practitioners to identify new homes in a new structure.

Proactive issues, that were viewed as needing reflective discussion leading to initiatives, included:

- Communication between and among psychologists, which may require restructuring conventions, journals, and other media in order to facilitate the interaction between science and practice;
- Implications of "organizations as clients" upon research, practice, ethical standards, professional standards, accreditation, and licensure;
- Organizational alternatives for APA, which might be useful and creative coming from those who are knowledgeable about organizations and processes of organizational renewal.

Minutes of the meeting are being distributed to all APA Council Representatives, Division Presidents, and members of Division 14's Executive Committee. Another meeting will be held in August, in conjunction with the next Council meetings in Toronto.

The Department of Psychology at the University of Kansas announces that it has opened enrollment in its Master of Arts program to persons with interests in the areas of organizational and personnel psychology. Prospective applicants should request information from the Department admissions secretary. Programs of study will be tailor-made to fit the needs of particular students and will include (i) specialized work in the Department, (ii) work in general and social psychology, (iii) work in statistics and methodology, (iv) work outside the Department in Business or Human Relations, and (v) masters thesis including field report option. The program is designed to meet the needs of persons wishing to do post-baccalaureate specialized study in these areas prior to employment and/or to meet the needs of persons desiring to prepare themselves for doctoral-level work at some other institution. Information on the program is available from: **Howard Baumgartel, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Psychology, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KA 66045**

In-Basket TIPBITS

by Mike Kavanagh

Since this issue has such a terribly important and serious theme for all I/O psychologists, it was suggested that I write a "straight" column. Nope.

Volunteers! Volunteers! Volunteers?? Jerry Niven, male Chairperson, Committee on Committees, distributed a questionnaire to Division 14ers asking for interest in the division's committees. He reported at the Winter Executive Committee meeting to have received 88 positive responses, of which 53 were interested in somehow assisting on **TIP**. You will all be contacted. But, don't wait for us. If you have an idea, and are willing to put forth the effort to develop it for **TIP**, write to me. Or, if you want to write a short article on a topic of your choice, do it and send it to **TIP**. As you can tell from previous issues, we publish a variety of topics. Or, if you want to send us a cartoon, please do.

Speaking of cartoons, there are none in this issue. In a tight vote by secret ballot, Gary Johns won the first annual **TIP** cartoon contest. His prize, life after death, is being mailed to him third-class in a plain brown envelope. News flash from APA council . . . Division 14 now has five seats as a result of the recent election. I/O Power. Division 14 Workshops appear elsewhere in this issue. The offerings look quite good, and the Workshop Committee should be credited for a fine job so far. Judging from past years, and with Ken Wexley as male Chairperson, **TIP** is optimistic Toronto's program will be super.

Bob Dugan is one of the three APA representative members of the Joint Review Committee on the Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests. The Committee is sponsored by the three organizations (APA, American Educational Research Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education) responsible for *Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests*.

Organizational psychologists organized an organizational meeting in Houston on February 27th. The word from Jim Herring is that "approximately 30 applied psychologists attended and expressed a desire to establish an independent association of local I/O psychologists." I know, if they were so organized, why didn't they get an exact count of their charter members. Maybe an accountant should be invited to join, Jim.

Ron Johnson sent **TIP** a copy of the preliminary IAAP program and was nice enough to identify twelve Division 14 members who will be involved in presentations. They include: Lyman Porter, Larry Cummings, Bob Guion, Rick Steers, Ben Schneider, Peter Weissenberg, Fred Fiedler, Bob House, Pete Dachler, Mark Lifter, and Ginny Schein. Have a good time in Munich, all, and thanks for the **TIPBIT**, Ron.

The 1st Annual Symposium on Applied Behavioral Science was held on April 27-28 at Virginia Polytechnical Institute and State University, sponsored by the Department of Psychology. A number of Division 14 members participated, unfortunately, **TIP** received the announcement too late for the February issue. Thus, this is a case of "not getting it first, but getting it right."

Division 20 is also sponsoring a pre-convention workshop on August 27 in Toronto. The workshop, "Teaching Undergraduate Courses in Adult Development and Aging," is designed to assist academics in the development and teaching of Adult Development and Aging courses. The fee is \$30.00, deadline for registration is July 1, and the person to contact for registration is: Dr. Irene M. Hulicka, Dean of Natural and Social Sciences, State University of New York College at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14222.

Inspired by the WNSC's contribution in the February issue of **TIP**, Bill Cayley sent the following information:

"To those wishing further instruction in the fine art, philosophy and derivation of the glitch and the kludge, to which Murphy's and all other laws are infallibly related, I recommend *Malice in Blunderland* by Tom Martin (McGraw-Hill, 1973). In this delightful volume one learns all manner of useful . . . why organizations resemble septic tanks (the really big chunks float to the top — Imhoff's Law); why, in all problematic situations someone has a smile on his face (someone else can be blamed — Jone's Law); why educational innovation is so slow in coming (may only be accomplished in the presence of faculty antipathy or euphoria — Saunder's Law). Anyone thinking of taking my advice and obtaining a copy of *Malice in Blunderland* might wish to consider Thoreau's Law: 'If you see a man approaching you with the obvious intent of doing you good, you should run for your life.'"

According to the WNSC, if you try to buy this book, you will most likely: break a leg, wreck your car, lose your wallet (purse), slip on a banana peel, OR, all of the above. When you finally get to the bookstore, the book will be out of print — WNSC Law.

If that news about the WNSC didn't excite you, try this — Al Kurtz is writing an elementary statistics text in which he wants to reprint Murphy's and Gumperson's Laws, The Transcription Square, The Theory of ISPE, and the Rule of Accuracy. Obviously, any comment on this is unnecessary, so I'll make one. WOW!

This year the O. B. Teaching Conference will be held at the University of South Carolina, College of Business Administration, May 24-27. If you have your **TIP** on time, and wish to attend, you should call Alan Randolph at (803) 777-7285 for details. Unfortunately, this announcement was not received in time for the February issue.

TIP has received a concise and well-written question/answer summary of the proposed Federal employee selection rules from Don Livingston. Don prepared it for his clients and is making it available to anyone for \$2.50, trying to recover his printing costs.

ALUMNI REUNION — The Purdue Association of Graduate Students in Industrial Psychology (PAGSIP) is planning to have an alumni reunion at APA in Toronto. Any member planning to attend should write to PAGSIP, c/o Pat Knight, SCAX, Purdue University, W. Lafayette, IN 47907. That's a PAGSIP SCAX APA reunion — right, Gary.

Congratulations are in order for Jack Barlett. He is resigning, after ten years, as male chairperson of the Psychology Department at the University of Maryland. Jack is returning to full time teaching and research as, in his words, a "real" professor. Welcome back to the "straight" world.

Another kudo for Fred Herzberg — he was named to receive the 1978 James A. Hamilton-Hospital Administrators' Book-of-the-Year Award by the American College of Hospital Administrators for his book *The Managerial Choice: To Be Efficient and To Be Human*. The award was presented at the Society's 21st annual Congress on Administration in February in Chicago.

TIP's spies in Evanston found Jeanne Herman absolutely over her head with work. However, she did send **TIP** the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Organization of APA. According to Jeanne, the Board did not discuss the report, but simply agreed to forward it to APA's Board of Directors with a cover letter saying such things as: 1) the Board is convinced that restructuring is necessary, 2) the Board recommends that the B/D appoint a task force restructuring, 3) that the task force consider the ad hoc committee's proposal as one possible proposal for restructuring, and 4) that the B/D distribute all of the proposals

for restructuring widely. The Board did not wish to go on record as necessarily favoring this particular proposal.

Although we are a bit ashamed to mention, the WNSC has submitted a reorganization plan for APA. Their first idea, "why don't we all just be psychologists," was soundly defeated (16 to 15). Thus, the following compromise was developed — APA should be organized along ethnic lines. There would be all the hyphenated American groups who would probably have more in common than most of the present divisional structures. Furthermore, their convention parties would be super, and APA Council would become analogous to the U.N.

Well, the main feature is over and it is time for the travelogue. Upon visiting the "Big Apple", TIP learned that Jay Finkelman was promoted to Professor of Psychology at the Bernard M. Baruch College of the City University of New York — Congrats. Jeff Daum met TIP for cocktails and told us that he has joined JCPenney in its corporate personnel Human Resource Strategy Development department. Finally, struggling for a cab at two in the morning, TIP discovered that Joe Cosentino accepted a position as a Senior Consultant Psychologist with Lopez Assessment Services, Inc., in Port Washington, New York. His address, scribbled on a napkin, is Felix M. Lopez & Associates, Inc., 14 Vanderventer Avenue, Port Washington, New York 11050.

Forced to leave "the city" by a cab driver strike, a garbage collector strike, a police "blue-out", and a lamplighter blackout, TIP headed for Philly. Surprise upon surprise, Jim Thurber has moved to the East again. He is now Manager of Human Resource Development for Westinghouse Electric Corporation, and only a stone's throw from the airport runway. Does that mean that Jim can throw stones at airplanes or get stoned watching them.

Leaving Philly and Jim's house, TIP headed south. After a short-cut through Buffalo, TIP found that Bill Curtis is now with the Space Division of General Electric in Arlington, Virginia. He recently left Weyerhaeuser to accept a position as a research psychologist with GE's Information Systems Programs where he will be working on the selection and training of computer programmers and the management of software development projects.

Bored with the coast, TIP went to the coast on the other side and found that Rich Arvey was just finishing a year as a visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley. Rich is moving to Houston next year where he has an appointment in the Department of Psychology at the University of Houston.

Returning to Bingo on the Peter Pan Air Express, "Spring caused syrupy feelings to become Gran Prix racers," and the Editor went over-the-brink.

Got any news or deviant thoughts — send to Mickey Kavanagh, School of Management, SUNY-Binghamton, New York 13901. The deadline for the August issue is June 15, 1978.

SHARE YOUR TIP

When you finish reading TIP, share
it with someone.

THAT'S PUBLIC RELATIONS

I/O Documents Clearinghouse

by Steve Cohen

The E&T Committee is pleased to announce a new Service for Division 14 members. It will assume the responsibility of serving in a clearinghouse capacity for non-published, yet valuable, documents relevant to I/O Psychology.

The objective of the Clearinghouse Function is to facilitate better dissemination of documents that are continually generated, but which for one reason or another are actually read by very few people. These documents might include, but are not limited to, such things as: pilot research studies, technical reports, validity studies, organization program descriptions and materials, annotated bibliographies, reference lists, etc. They will not include, however, pre-publication studies or any other material that is likely to become or has already been published and/or distributed through other means. The Clearinghouse Function is in no way intended to usurp the role of professional journals, but rather to provide an outlet for good quality unpublished documents that might be of value to others in the field. Furthermore, since the Clearinghouse will in no way serve an evaluation function, it will be the responsibility of the author/provider to determine the value of the material offered.

Quite literally, this new service will not resemble most Clearinghouse operations. Rather than distributing actual documents from a centralized location, the I/O Clearinghouse will merely provide a listing of useful material that can be obtained by contacting the appropriate author/provider. The Clearinghouse will collect the information and then periodically list in TIP the titles, author/providers' names and addresses, a brief description of the material, and reproduction costs if applicable. Those interested in obtaining the materials will respond directly to the provider as they would for reprint requests. Those providers who wish to charge for reproduction expenses may do so at their own discretion (and conscience!).

The first Clearinghouse listing will be provided in TIP's August issue. Those of you who have material which you believe will be useful to others should send the following information:

- Full title of document(s).
- If necessary, a brief (1-2 lines) document(s) description, which should identify type of material; e.g. reference list, research study, program description, etc.
- Full name(s) of author/provider(s).
- Full address from where material can be obtained.
- Costs per copy, if any, for materials.

DO NOT SEND THE ACTUAL MATERIALS

to:

Dr. Stephen L. Cohen
Director of Assessment Center Services
Harbridge House, Inc.
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

The proliferation of written material that I/O Psychology has witnessed during recent years is astonishing. Given the rapid growth of Division 14 we must continually monitor the need for improved communications. We believe that the I/O Documents Clearinghouse will serve that need while it will enable all of us to become better informed of the considerable amount of useful information that has heretofore not been widely distributed. Please send your listings to me soon. We shall look forward to your participation in making the I/O Clearinghouse a successful venture.

A Review of Continuing Education - Why Does It Effect I/O Psychologists?

by Irwin L. Goldstein

While most I/O psychologists would agree that continuing education could help us all to maintain and improve our skills, there is still the question why are we suddenly so concerned about the development of formal continuing education models and programs? The answer is that in addition to the concerns of individuals for their own personal development, there has been an increasing demand by legislative and consumer groups for the development of continuing education requirements. Thus, in 1974, nearly 70 bills were introduced in various state legislatures concerning mandatory continuing education requirements in professions including optometrists, dentists and dental hygienists, pharmacists, registered nurses, etc. In addition, some professional association have also started to impose requirements for continued membership. For example, the American Psychiatric Association recently announced that beginning July 1, 1976, members will have three years in which to complete 150 hours of continuing education in order to retain their membership.

Even more pertinent to I/O psychologists, eleven state boards have introduced continuing education requirements in order to maintain certification or licensing. Another 15 states are now considering or developing legislation. In the past, health service providers like clinical and counseling psychologists formed the substantial portion of certified or licensed psychologists. Recent developments are resulting in increasing pressure on I/O psychologists to be certified or licensed and as a result to be subject to state imposed continuing education requirements. An illustration of these developments is the 1974 American Psychological Association draft document entitled: Standards for Providers of Psychological Services. In this document, the activities of I/O Psychologists are included as psychological services, consultation services or research services to a facility, institution, organization, business or industrial concern in settings including educational, health, correctional/judicial and business/ industrial environments. Additionally, the important point is not what the providers call themselves but rather the types of services offered. Thus, Division 14 members and others who have job titles like organizational behaviorists or management specialists would still be included as offering psychological services. The inclusion of industrial/organizational psychological activities as offering psychological services to the public means that Division 14 members will be under increasing pressure to become certified or licensed in their respective jurisdictions. Also, of course, our membership will be subject to continuing education requirements. Thus, it is imperative that any mandatory continuing education requirements meet the needs of I/O psychologists as well as the needs of health service providers.

Due to these concerns, Division 14's E & T Committee has been working with the American Psychological Association's Continuing Education Committee to help ensure that the needs of I/O Psychologists are met in any plan proposed by A.P.A. As a result of this interaction, the individualized continuing education model proposed by Division 14 is included as an option in the APA draft of their model plan. The ingredients of the Division 14 plan can be found in 8/77 issue of **TIP**. The E & T Committee intends to keep working with A.P.A. on the development of model plans. At the same time, E & T is developing plans to implement relevant continuing education workshops and programs for I/O members. If you have any comments or suggestion or questions, please send them on to **Irv Goldstein, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.**

JOURNAL REVIEW SERVICE

by Lynn Plumlee

Any suggestions readers have for making the Journal Review Service more useful will be appreciated. We shall also welcome recommendations from readers of significant articles. These recommendations should be sent to me at Box 63, Star Route, Cedar Crest, N.M. 87008. They will be forwarded to the person with responsibility for the topical area for further consideration. Any such contributor is hereby guaranteed immunity from pressure to become a reviewer. Volunteers will, however, be greeted with appropriate enthusiasm.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY AND LEGAL ISSUES IN INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Bakke vs. University of California; why 117 medical schools can't be right. *Change*, October 1977, 18-33; 58-61; 64. Most of the issue is devoted to an evaluation, pro and con, of the critical reverse discrimination Bakke case. (P. J. O'Neill)

Symposium on the minority candidate and the bar examination. *The Black Law Journal*, 1976, 5, 120-201. Bar examination processes, opinions on factors contributing to failure on the examination, suggestions for practices with respect to group differences. (R. F. Boldt)

Ginensky, A.B., Rogoff, A.R. Subjective employment criteria and the future of Title VII in professional jobs. *Journal of Urban Law*, 1976, 54, 165-236. Analysis of case law by job level (blue collar, white collar, professional), compares EEOC and court decisions, and discusses litigation strategies. (R. F. Boldt)

Stacy, E.R. Subjective criteria in employment decisions under Title VII. *Georgia Law Review*, 1976, 10, 737-752. Discussion of case law from defendant's view. (R.F. Boldt)

MEASUREMENT TECHNIQUES

Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric theory — 25 years ago and now. *Educational Researcher* November, 1975, 7-14; 19-21. A highly personal history of the major advances and issues in psychometrics since 1950. (P.J. O'Neill)

Subkoviak, M.J. The use of multidimensional scaling in educational research. *Review of Educational Research*, 1975, 45, 387-423. Authoritative review of multidimensional scaling, which concludes that a researcher should consider adding scaling to his repertoire of research tools, along with multiple regression and factor analysis. (P. J. O'Neill)

STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Brown, M.B., and Benedetti, J.K. Sampling behavior of tests for correlation in two-way contingency tables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1977, 72, 309-315. Provides formulas and modified standard errors for five measures of correlation for contingency tables. Asymptotic standard errors are compared for accuracy. (L.B. Plumlee)

Overall, J.E., and Woodward, J.A. Discriminant analysis with categorical data. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1977, 1, 371-384. Demonstrates utilization of categorical data in discriminant analysis, including assignment to groups on the basis of categorized profile analysis. (L. B. Plumlee)

Toronto Convention Program - A Preview

by Gini Boehm

The Program Committee (in collaboration with the 100 people who submitted program proposals!) is assembling a 1978 APA Convention program that will appeal to a wide variety of Division 14 interests.

The complete program will appear in **TIP's** next issue, but here are some highlights to help you plan your trip to Toronto.

Plan to come early and stay late! Sixteen of our 89 hours of program time have to be scheduled on the Convention's first and last days.

On the first day one of the highlights will be a symposium on "Strategies and Experiences with Internships in I/O Psychology," chaired by **Dennis Courtney**. Whether you're investigating internship possibilities for your students, an I/O practitioner looking for interns, or a graduate student seeking an internship experience, you'll find this symposium of interest.

The last day of the convention, a symposium, "Affirmative Action in Testing and Selection: Legal and Psychological Perspectives," chaired by **Don Schwartz** should bring us up to date on a area of widespread and ongoing interest.

Tuesday, the second day, will be "Division 14 Day." The Open Forum, Business Meeting, Presidential Address and Social hour are scheduled for Tuesday. Also, there will be a symposium, chaired by **Martin Geller**, with the intriguing title "Can I/O Psychology Survive the Advancement of Professional Psychology?"

For invited addresses we've asked two leaders from other areas of psychology to explain the relevance of their work to our field. **Charles Cofer** will talk about "Cognitive Psychology and the Problem of Motivation: Implications for I/O Psychology," and **Melvin Novick** will speak on "The Implications of Bayesian Statistics for I/O Psychology." These addresses are scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday.

Also, on Wednesday, Division 14 will be holding its first Poster Session. Seven very diverse papers are scheduled for this session which will be chaired by **Rich Klimoski**.

These are just a few examples of what is planned for Toronto. See you there!

DIVISION 19 WORKSHOP

The Division of Military Psychology (19) is sponsoring a one-day, pre-convention workshop on Sunday, August 27, in Toronto. The workshop is entitled "Issues in Organizational Development and Effectiveness in Military Organizations," and will include **Bert King**, Office of Naval Research; **T. Owen Jacobs**, Army Research Institute; **Allan Jones**, Navy Health Research; and **Laurie Broedling**, Navy Personnel R & D Center. The workshop will involve a review of OD and organizational assessment programs, methods, and philosophies among military organizations with invited consultants to lead discussion of issues in organizational theory, change techniques, and methods for program evaluation. The location was unknown at **TIP's** deadline, however, interested persons should write for further information to: **Bert King, Organizational Effectiveness Research Programs, ONR, 800 North Quincy Street, Arlington, VA 22217.**

26TH ANNUAL INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY WORKSHOPS

Presented as part of the annual convention of
The American Psychological Association

Sunday, August 27, 1978

Sheraton Center

Toronto, Ontario

WORKSHOP COMMITTEE

Kenneth N. Wexley, Chairperson

Kenneth M. Alvares, Treasurer

Preston E. Smith, Arrangements

V. Jon Bentz

Warren S. Blumenfeld

Ann Howard

David W. Lacey

Terence R. Mitchell

John N. Turner

Sheldon Zedeck

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

Sunday, August 27, 1978

Sheraton Center

Toronto, Ontario

8:15 a.m. - 9:00 a.m. Registration
9:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. Workshop Session
12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m. Lunch
1:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Workshop Session
5:30 p.m. - 7:30 p.m. Cocktail Party

- Section I The Quality of Work Life Movement in the United States
Edward E. Lawler & J. Richard Hackman
- Section II Current Problems in Selection Research
Marvin D. Dunnette & Floyd D. Marquardt
- Section III Assessment Centers: Current Applications and Solutions to Administrative Problems
Douglas W. Bray
- Section IV The Professional Management of Executive Stress
Harry Levinson
- Section V Need Assessment and Evaluation Processes in the Design of Training Programs
Irwin L. Goldstein
- Section VI Government Selection Guidelines and Relevant Case Law: Implications for Research and Practice
Mary L. Tenopir & Thompson Powers
- Section VII Counseling Systems in Modern Industrial Organizations
Laurence J. Bollinger & Roger E. Hawkins
- Section VIII Evaluating and Implementing Systematic Staffing Policies and Procedures: Impact of Recent EEO Developments
Richard E. Clingenpeel
- Section IX Current Trends in Organization Development
Michael Beer & Edgar F. Huse
- Section X Measurement of Managerial Motivation
John B. Miner

The workshops listed above were selected by the Committee after polling last year's workshop participants for their preferences regarding future topics and leaders.

Workshop sessions will again be one-half day in length. You will have choice of two sections according to your preference and the availability of the workshop section.

Division 14 workshops are for informational purposes only and do not necessarily imply DIVISION 14 endorsement of positions or views expressed by leaders or participants.

SECTION I THE QUALITY OF WORK LIFE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Edward E. Lawler
University of Michigan

J. Richard Hackman
Yale University

This workshop will provide a general introduction to recent developments and trends in the quality of work life. The plan is to cover the history and background of the quality of work life movement, the legislative implications of the movement, the various quality of work life centers in the United States, different approaches to improving the quality of work life, and the concept of public reporting on the quality of work life by corporations. The leaders will provide a brief introduction to a number of topics and allow the participants to direct them to focus on those particular aspects of the quality of work life movement in which it is particularly interested.

Dr. Edward E. Lawler, III is a professor of Psychology and a Program Director in the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. He also serves as Visiting Scientist at Battelle Memorial Institute in Seattle. Professor Lawler earned his doctorate in organizational psychology at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964. He was at Yale from 1964 to 1972. Ed conducts research on a variety of topics in organizational psychology including the design of work, the relationship of extrinsic rewards to motivation, and labor-management cooperation to improve the quality of work life. He is on the editorial board of several professional journals and has consulted with a number of organizations on quality of work life issues. His most recent book is *Information and Control in Organizations*, which was published by Goodyear.

Dr. J. Richard Hackman is Associate Professor of Administrative Sciences and of Psychology at Yale University. He earned his doctorate in social psychology at the University of Illinois in 1966. He has been at Yale since then. Dick conducts research on a variety of topics in organizational psychology, including the design of jobs, the task effectiveness of work groups, and the social influences on individual work behavior. He is on the editorial board of several professional journals, and has consulted with a number of organizations on quality of work life issues.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
Terence R. Mitchell
University of Washington

SECTION II CURRENT PROBLEMS IN SELECTION RESEARCH

Marvin D. Dunnette
Personnel Decisions, Inc.
University of Minnesota

Lloyd D. Marquardt
Traveler's Insurance Company

This workshop will consider structured job analysis approaches as they relate to the validation process and issues of validity generalization and transportability. The primary focus of the workshop will be on recent developments in research approaches to content and construct validation strategies. The relevance of these research processes to the recently issued Federal Guidelines will be explored.

Dr. Marvin Dunnette is past president of Division 14, a professor of psychology at the University of Minnesota, a founder of the consulting firm Personnel Decisions, and President of Personnel Decisions Research Institute. Author of many papers and books, he also is the author of the *Handbook of Industrial Psychology* and this year will be the editor of the Industrial Section for the *Annual Review of Psychology*. During the past few years Marv has done fundamental work in developing new research approaches associated with content and construct validity strategies. He has also worked extensively with structured job analysis techniques.

Dr. Lloyd Marquardt has had extensive experience in developing and working with structured job analysis techniques. He co-authored several technical reports relating to the background research and development of the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ), and has had considerable experience in adapting the PAQ test validation strategies. He has also developed a more simplified task analysis checklist for use in analyzing jobs. His experience includes the use of structured job analysis data for grouping and developing a taxonomy of clerical jobs on the basis of task similarity. He's also used structured job analysis for comparing jobs from several locations to insure the appropriateness of validity generalization. Dr. Marquardt came out of Purdue University, worked in the Psychological Research Section of Sears, Roebuck and Company in Chicago and is currently Manager, Personnel Research, Traveler's Insurance Company in Hartford, Conn.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
V. Jon Bentz
Sears, Roebuck & Co.

SECTION III ASSESSMENT CENTERS: CURRENT APPLICATIONS AND SOLUTIONS TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS

Douglas W. Bray
AT&T

The purpose of this workshop is to give participants up-to-date knowledge of the range of assessment center applications including managerial jobs, specialist positions, clinical psychology, and middle years research; give participants a deeper understanding of the essentials of assessment: dimensions, techniques, assessors, and feedback; make participants more sophisticated about the relationships of assessment to appraisal, human resources planning, and training needs analysis. The workshop will include a presentation and discussion of a range of supervisory management assessment programs, sales and engineering assessment, assessment of clinical psychologists, and middle years assessment in the Management Progress Study. Videotapes will be used to illustrate stimuli to assesses and assessor training.

Dr. Douglas Bray designed the first Management Assessment Center in 1956 as part of the Bell System's Management Progress Study. Since then he has supervised the development of an extensive assessment center system in AT&T in which 160,000 employees have been assessed. He has recently pioneered the application of the method to the examination of the professional competence of clinical psychologists. Doug has authored many articles on the assessment center method and delivered numerous talks on the subject both in the United States and many foreign countries. In 1977 Doug was the first recipient of Division 14's Professional Practice Award for his achievements in the assessment center area. He is currently Director of Basic Human Resources Research for AT&T.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
Ann Howard
AT&T

SECTION IV THE PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT OF EXECUTIVE STRESS

Harry Levinson
Levinson Institute

The purpose of this workshop is to develop a frame of reference for understanding executive stress; and to delineate some principles to guide the management/organizational psychologist in dealing with such programs. The leader will develop the concept of the ego ideal and its relationship to the self-image

as the core of vulnerability to stress and amplify that concept by tracing its implications through the stages of adult development in the context of the increasing ambiguity, competitiveness, and transiency in the managerial world. Lecture and case discussion will be used. Organizational cases will be presented for small group discussion and larger group summary to illustrate the principles related to the management of executive stress.

Dr. Harry Levinson is President of the Levinson Institute and Lecturer at the Harvard Medical School.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
David W. Lacey
Cellanese Corporation

SECTION V NEED ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION PROCESSES IN THE DESIGN OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Irwin L. Goldstein
University of Maryland

This workshop will focus on the basic components of instructional systems design with particular emphasis on the need assessment and evaluation process. The discussion of need assessment will emphasize organizational person and task analyses including the presentation of examples of various approaches. The presentation on evaluation of training programs will focus on material related to criterion and program evaluation issues. The approach will emphasize training as part of organizational systems rather than as a technology. This emphasis will include the consideration of issues like training as an intervention and the use of training data in fair employment practices cases.

Dr. Irwin Goldstein's research on training and evaluation has included studies in various organizations including business, service, school and government. He is the author of a book in the Brooks/Cole series entitled *Training: Program Development and Evaluation* (1974) and is currently preparing a chapter on Training for the *Annual Review of Psychology*. He is a Fellow of the Division of Industrial/Organizational Psychology of the American Psychological Association. Irv serves on the editorial board of *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* and is associate editor for the *Human Factors Journal*.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
Sheldon Zedeck
University of Cal., Berkeley

SECTION VI GOVERNMENT SELECTION GUIDELINES AND RELEVANT CASE LAW: IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

Mary L. Tenopyr
AT&T

Thompson Powers
Steptoe & Johnson, Attorneys

The purpose of this workshop is to present an overview of the latest developments relative to government guidelines and relevant litigations. The workshop will be largely devoted to a simulated counselor-client discussion of preparation for litigation. In the course of this, the following topics will be discussed: (1) determination of adverse impact, (2) concept of relevant labor pool, (3) criterion-related validation, (4) content validation, (5) construct validation, and (6) test fairness. Mr. Powers will summarize recent developments from a legal point of view. Dr. Tenopyr will talk on the psychological implications and summarize recent research relevant to validation of selection procedures. Ample opportunity for interaction with participants will be provided.

Mr. Powers is a partner in the firm of Steptoe and Johnson, Attorneys, in Washington, D.C. He has a wide range of experience in equal employment litigation and direct negotiation with government EEO agencies. Dr. Tenopyr is Manager - Research in the Human Resources Department of American Telephone and Telegraph Company. Mary has conducted research on test fairness, served as an adviser to the OFCCP and also has had numerous face-to-face contacts with government agencies involved in developing employee selection guidelines and regulations.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
Sheldon Zedeck
University of Cal., Berkeley

SECTION VII COUNSELING SYSTEMS IN MODERN INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Laurence J. Bollinger
Dow Chemical

Roger E. Hawkins
Consultant

This workshop will present effective counseling intervention strategies. Emphasis will be placed on executive counseling, as well as alcohol, drugs, and other personal employee problems. Methods of training, as well as management education in the recognition of and proper referral for these problems, will be discussed. Case studies will be employed to illustrate counseling techniques and generate group discussions.

Dr. Larry Bollinger is the Employee Relations Manager for Dow's Michigan Division. During his twenty-one years with Dow, he has held several management positions in the department of psychology and training resources. His PhD is in clinical psychology from Wayne State University, and Larry is a member of the Governor's Mental Health Advisory Board in Michigan. Also, he chaired the 1976 Division 14 workshops.

Dr. Roger Hawkins has recently established a consulting practice. As the principal in his firm, he specializes in career assessment and planning for senior managers; career path planning; and organizational planning and development. Prior to establishing his consulting firm, Roger's background included extensive experience in business and education: most recently as Director, Personnel Development with Celanese Corporation; and earlier as Department Head, Department of General Business and Executive Director, Bureau of Business Services and Research at Eastern Michigan University. His PhD is from Illinois Institute of Technology in organizational and management psychology; and he is now a member of the Board of Directors of the New Jersey Institute for Family Services.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
David W. Lacey
Celanese Corporation

SECTION VIII EVALUATING AND IMPLEMENTING SYSTEMATIC STAFFING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: IMPACT OF RECENT EEO DEVELOPMENTS

Richard E. Clingenpeel
General Motors

Developments in EEO caselaw and government regulations make it clear that all staffing (especially selection and promotion) procedures are subject to challenge as potentially discriminatory and non job-related. However, except for test validation requirements, it is not clear what steps employers should take to review, evaluate,

and modify their procedures. The purpose of this workshop is to suggest actions that can be taken in this area. Specific subjects to be discussed are: (1) standards for evaluating staffing procedures; (2) job analyses; (3) determining qualification requirements; (4) documenting staffing decisions; (5) identifying and delegating responsibility for staffing decisions; (6) monitoring staffing procedures. The workshop is intended for people with administrative or research responsibilities for staffing procedures. Familiarity with government guidelines on employee selection procedures and relevant caselaw will be helpful, but is not required. Handout and worksheets will be provided.

Dr. Richard Clingenpeel is a Purdue graduate. He joined G.M. as a member of the faculty at General Motors Institute and then transferred to the Corporate Personnel Administration and Development Staff. His responsibilities now include management of research and development on salaried personnel selection policies and procedures for corporatewide implementation.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
John N. Turner
Ford Motor Company

SECTION IX CURRENT TRENDS IN ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

Michael Beer
Harvard University

Edgar F. Huse
Boston College

This workshop will provide an overview of what OD is today. Since the content and definition of OD has been changing over the past 10 years, an attempt will be made to describe the current scope of OD. For example, the evolution of OD from interpersonally oriented interventions such as T group to more task oriented interventions such as team building will be discussed. Similarly, the evolution from a micro perspective focused on group process to a macro perspective encompassing organization structure, control and reward systems will be described. The implication of these changes for the skills, role, and organization of OD consulting resources will also be discussed. The workshop will be designed to allow participants to share experiences relevant to these issues. Cases (sent to participants in advance) will be used to give participants an opportunity to experience diagnosing organizational problems, developing a change plan and deciding on an intervention strategy.

Dr. Edgar Huse is the author of *Organization Development and Change*, West, 1975. He is the senior author of *Behavior in Organizations*, Addison-Wesley, 1977 (rev); and *Readings on Behavior in Organizations*, Addison-Wesley, 1975. He is currently Chairman, Organizational Studies Department, Boston College. In addition to working for SOHIO, Raytheon and General Electric, he has consulted with a large variety of organizations, including hospitals, banks and insurance companies.

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
Preston E. Smith
IBM

SECTION X MEASUREMENT OF MANAGERIAL MOTIVATION

John B. Miner
Georgia State University

This workshop will provide a general understanding of managerial role-motivation theory, of approaches to the measurement of its major variables, and of the research related to managerial motivation. Specific topics include: (1) the development and use of psychometrically sound projective measures of managerial

motivation; (2) existing validation research utilizing concurrent and longitudinal designs; (3) research with females and minority managers and its implications for EEO compliance; (4) training evaluation research conducted to determine the effectiveness of programs designed to arouse or develop managerial motivation; (5) the extension of the role-motivation theory paradigm to the realm of professional motivation and its measurement; and (6) research currently being conducted including studies of top corporate officers and of career development applications. A lecture-discussion approach will be used and sample measuring instruments provided.

Dr. John Miner obtained his doctorate in personality theory from Princeton University and is currently Research Professor of Management at Georgia State University. His business experience includes employment as an industrial psychologist by Atlantic-Richfield and by McKinsey and Company. Jack has been a Fellow in Division 14 for many years and is a past chairman of its Program Committee. He is presently completing his term as President of the Academy of Management. His books dealing with the subject matter of the workshop include *Studies in Management Education* (OMS Press, 1965), *The Human Constraint* (BNA Books, 1974), *The Challenge of Managing* (Saunders, 1975) and *Motivation to Manage* (OMS Press, 1977).

Workshop Enrollment
25 participants

Workshop Coordinator
Warren S. Blumenfeld
Georgia State University

REGISTRATION
26th Annual APA Division 14 Workshops
Sunday, August 27, 1978

Sheraton Center

Toronto, Ontario

Name (Please Print) _____

Position _____

Mailing Address _____

Phone AC _____ Extension _____

APA Division Membership(s) _____

RANK ORDER 1- 6 THOSE WORKSHOP SECTIONS YOU WOULD BE INTERESTED IN ATTENDING. YOU WILL BE SCHEDULED TO TWO (2) HALF DAY SESSIONS ACCORDING TO YOUR PREFERENCE AND THE AVAILABILITY OF THE WORKSHOP SECTION.

- () I The Quality of Work Life Movement in the United States
() II Current Problems in Selection Research
() III Assessment Centers: Current Applications and Solutions to Administrative Problems

- () IV The Professional Management of Executive Stress
() V Need Assessment and Evaluation Processes in the Design of Training Programs
() VI Government Selection Guidelines and Relevant Case Law: Implications for Research and Practice
() VII Counseling Systems in Modern Industrial Organizations
() VIII Evaluating and Implementing Systematic Staffing Policies and Procedures: Impact of Recent EEO Developments
() IX Current Trends in Organization Development
() X Measurement of Managerial Motivation

REGISTER EARLY AS ENROLLMENT IS LIMITED

\$85 APA Members

\$100 non APA Members

Cocktail Party - \$7 for first guest, \$10 for each additional guest.

Check or money order in U.S. currency must accompany registration form and made payable to **APA DIVISION 14 WORKSHOP COMMITTEE**. Cancellations received after July 27 will be honored only if the two workshop sections are full.

Mail this form with fee to: Ken Alvares, Treasurer
Department of Psychology
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
(419) 372-2301

RECENT BOOKS BY 14 MEMBERS

People in Organizations: Understanding their Behavior, Terry Mitchell, McGraw-Hill.

Equal Rights and Industrial Relations, chapters by Bob Hempston, Shel Zedeck, Mary Tenopyr, and Richard Lester, Industrial Relations Research Association.

Toward a Post-Industrial Psychology: Emerging Perspectives on Technology, Work, Education and Leisure, Don Mankin, John Wiley.

Statistical Reasoning in Psychology and Education, Ed Minium, John Wiley.

Background Factors: A Study of Work Motivation Attitudes of Urban and Rural Apparel Workers in Tennessee, Emma Bragg, University Microfilms International.

Applying the Assessment Center Method, Joe Moses and Bill Byham, Pergamon Press.

Improving Personnel Selection Through Effective Interviewing: Essentials for Management, Ben Balinsky, Martin Bruce Publishers.

New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness, Paul Goodman, Johannes Pennings, and Associates, Jossey Bass.

Public Testimony On Uniform Guidelines On Employee Selection Procedures

The following is testimony taken at an EEOCC meeting on December 22, 1977. The comments of some of the commission members should be enlightening. The editorial staff of **TIP** sees some good and some bad in these comments, but we will leave that judgment to you.

Al Blumrosen — Consultant

That is to say, that the objective of the guidelines is to encourage, or to secure improved employment opportunities for minorities and others who might otherwise be adversely affected by the use of selection procedure. If the employer community secures the results of an improved equal employment opportunity, then the thesis of the guidelines is that the government will not inquire deeply into the details of the process by which that was done.

Modification of selection procedures to avoid adverse impact is now on the same par, an equal par with validation as a strategy. We have a new Section VI in these guidelines that did not exist before which deals with the process of modification in selection procedures, and which describe ways that employers and other users may modify their selection procedures to avoid adverse impact.

Now where validation is used by the employer as a strategy, the concept of validation now clearly includes a requirement that the employer in selecting a selection procedure undertake a search for alternative procedures and use that alternative procedure which turns up as a result of the search, which has a lesser adverse impact and substantially equal validity.

Preston David — Executive Director

With regard to the document we are preserving the charge capability, we're preserving the rights of individuals and the testing issue it seems to me has always been spinning the wheels, it hasn't really produced.

Eleanor Holmes Norton — Chair.

We do not see, however, comparable evidence that validated tests have in fact gotten black and brown bodies, or for that matter, females into places as a result of the validation of those tests. In other words, we do not see the kind of casual relation we had expected to see.

Therefore, I see some very positive advantages I must say in encouraging an employer to look at what the ultimate goal is. That is to say, did your work force have some minorities and females before the test was validated or does it have any appreciable number now that the test has been validated? And if you really don't want to go through that, but you are interested in getting excluded people into your work force, we would encourage you to do so.

It is clear that in reserving its options through the use of the word "generally", this Commission has reserved the options if wanted to sue in every case next year. What it has said is that probably that wouldn't be terribly reasonable if you had a lot of minorities and women in there, one, and two, if we in any case will reserve for ourselves the option of choosing. In other words, we're putting employers on notice without at the same time limiting ourselves.

I can't live with that. I think employers can. And I think test validation gives then an A-1 out. Because if you validate your tests you don't have to worry about exclusion of minorities and women any longer, you have done what it seems to me is increasingly a fairly minimal thing to do given the sophistication of psychologists in coming up with validation. That leaves a whole generation, at least

if my guesstimate is accurate, that leaves a whole generation of, particularly black and brown people to wait, therefore, until their class status, their cultural opportunities, whatever it is that accounts for these disparities have caught up.

But I sincerely believe that tests do not tell us very much about who is qualified to do the job . . .

If I wanted really to find out whether or not you could do the job for me, I wouldn't give you the test. I'd call around and find out about you. Find out about how you did in the last job; find out if you came to work; find out — I mean, that's the way we all do it. The only reason that can't be done for the great masses of people, of course, is that there are too many of them.

It appears that intellectual performance on tests gets decided so early in a person's life that by the time he may be in the elementary grades that has been cast forever. Fortunately for us though human abilities are such that his ability to perform on many jobs has not in fact been cast in the same way that his ability to take a test has been.

Daniel E. Leach, Vice Chairman

. . . there are times when the Commission will indeed go after an employer whose bottom line may be pure, but who has a component of that selection process that is discriminatory.

The original EEOC guidelines, brought the psychological testing profession out of the closet and made them justify the premises on which they advised employers to select people for jobs. And in making them justify those premises we found that they weren't valid; that there was too often no relationship between the individual who applied and the job that they were seeking to get. And what happened — well, everybody knows what happened. It was the filter that was used to screen out blacks and women. And so EEOC deserves a great credit, I think, for putting those guidelines out and for making the psychological testing community come in and clarify the procedures that it was using.

We need their (psychologists) expertise in our cases when we examine selection processes. They don't seem to be fully on our side the way our guidelines are presently constituted. And these changes, I hope, will to some extent bring the psychological testing community into our camp.

Request for Papers for Annual Review Article

by Irwin L. Goldstein

Papers are requested on Personnel Training and Development to be considered for discussion and citation in the 1980 edition of **Annual Review of Psychology**. The article, which will be written by Irwin Goldstein, will review journal articles, technical reports and books published since John Campbell's review of the same topic in 1971. Materials concerning the following topics are of interests: 1) aspects of the training process itself including need assessment, criterion issues and evaluation strategies especially material which considers training as an intervention strategy in organizational environments; 2) the treatment of training as one aspect of organizational behavior systems including training as a source of expectations, learning, attitude formation, etc.; 3) the relationship of training to other issues including career development, second career training, fair employment practices, hard core unemployed, etc.; 4) empirical and conceptual material concerning particular training methodologies. Authors are encouraged to send materials relevant to the topic of Personnel Training and Development to Irwin L. Goldstein, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

Current Legislative and Regulatory Developments of Significance to Industrial/Organizational Psychologists

by James Ledvinka, Jerri Frantzve, and Kenneth Jackson

Division 14's committee on Public Policy and Social Issues has begun an effort to identify legislative and regulatory developments of significance to Division 14's members. Contacts with AAP, congressional offices, agency staff, and American Society for Personnel Administration has produced the list of items below. Based on conversations with people who helped us in this search, we feel that 1) these developments are important; 2) many of the issues are still evolving, which means Division members could take a proactive stance in terms of letter writing, testimony, contacting legislators, etc.; and 3) efforts by psychologists to inform or influence would be welcome in many cases.

We are also aware that there are perhaps other issues we have not identified and that new issues will arise. It is also likely that many of the division's members hold positions which allow early access to information on legislative issues of interest to other members. Consequently, we would like to propose that members send us information concerning legal issues with which they are familiar and which have potential significance to industrial/organizational psychologists. A list of these issues similar to the one below will be prepared and published periodically in *TIP*. The form following the list of legislative items has been prepared to facilitate your reporting to us.

1. Harrington testing bill (H.R. 6776)

Regulates educational testing; provides for test-taker rights of access to information about the test. Now being reversed for reintroduction; revision will include a federal testing commission, which would provide for translation of technical testing data into lay terminology.

Significance: attempts to deemphasize testing; may be a bellweather for regulation of non-educational testing.

2. Human Resource Development bill (H.R. 2596)

Authorizes funding of work redesign projects that attempt to alleviate periodic layoffs.

Significance: an opportunity for I/O psychologists to become involved in work redesign research; a boost for the quality-of-working-life field — but it will take a lot of pushing to get it passed.

3. New proposed uniform employee selection guidelines (42 Federal Register 65542, 12/30/77)

To replace EEOC and FEA guidelines. Approved by the staffs of all four federal EEO agencies; not yet formally adopted.

Significance: significance for personnel psychologists is apparent; several noteworthy changes.

4. Medical records privacy bill (H.R. 2593)

Prevents access to individuals' medical records kept by companies and other organizations without consent of the individual involved.

Significance: limits use of medical information in employee selection; limits access to personnel files holding medical information (which possibly affects access to other criterion information in the file for test validation); considerable impact on clinical assessment for personnel selection purposes.

5. Polygraph bill (S. 1845)

Bars the use of polygraph and voice analysis in pre-employment screening; also bans it for current employees unless they freely consent.

Significance: employee selection is affected, especially certain clinical assessment work for personnel selection. Subcommittee staff has expressed interest in hearing psychologists' viewpoints.

6. Worker compensation standards bill (H.R. 2058)

Establishes minimum standards for state coverage; consequently raises disability benefits in some states, with accompanying increases in worker compensation insurance premiums.

Significance: increases the economic importance of safety, thus it increases the importance of I/O psychologists' work in (a) safety training and (b) product and equipment design.

7. Human research and experimentation bill

To make permanent the current Commission governing the use of human subjects and extend coverage to CIA, Department of Defense, and perhaps other agencies.

Significance: brings more research under the umbrella of the human subjects guidelines. At early stages of development; prospects for passage seem good.

8. Mandatory retirement bill

To raise maximum allowable mandatory retirement age to 70.

Significance: affects employee benefit plans; increased ages of employees may bring about work redesign attempts.

9. New proposed EEOC affirmative action guidelines

Establishes EEOC policy of not pursuing "reverse discrimination" charges concerning actions taken pursuant to an affirmative action plan.

Significance: legitimizes the use of race, sex, etc. as a basis for employee selection; affects the implementation of employee selection procedures and the definition of "fairness" in selection; affects employee satisfaction/dissatisfaction with EEO.

10. Handicapped employee regulations (41 CFR 60-741)

Requires employers to make reasonable accommodation for the handicapped, requires them to justify employee qualifications that adversely affect the handicapped.

Significance: employee selection procedures must be reevaluated. Also has implications for validation studies: can criterion measure be job performance evaluation when employer has not made "reasonable accommodation" for that job? A continuous effort is going on to influence the development and application of these guidelines.

11. Job sharing bill (Oregon)

A state law mandating job sharing in state jobs in order to increase employ-

ment and decrease unemployment. (Job sharing is the holding of a single employment position by two or more people.)

Significance: affects job design, also raises questions about generalizing the validity of selection methods developed for normal jobs. The issue has nationwide interest, so the Oregon law may be the beginning of a trend.

Regulatory and Legislative Concerns

1. Legal Developments (bills, guidelines, etc.)

2. Significance to Industrial/Organizational Psychologists

3. Current Status

4. Contributed by

5. Please mail to: James Ledvinka
Department of Management
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30601

or Neal Schmitt
Department of Psychology
Olds Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

International Conference

This conference will be held 22-28 April, 1979 at Schloss Reisensburg (near Ulm), Federal Republic of Germany. The conference language will be English. Priority will be given to papers offering a research or empirical perspective, and those posing a well-developed conceptual or theoretical framework. Main areas of interest include the following: Problems of Interdisciplinary Cooperation; Life History of Interdisciplinary Research Groups; Managerial Problems of Interdisciplinary Research Groups; Interdisciplinary Research in the Organizational Context; Effectiveness of Interdisciplinary Research Groups; The Role of Interdisciplinary Research as an Instrument of Research Policy.

The papers to be presented will be selected by the Executive Secretary and the International Advisory Board. Authors who wish to present a paper are invited to send a detailed abstract (2-4 pages, 6 copies) by October 1, 1978 to: Dr. Rudy Steck, SFB79, Technische Universität Hannover, Callinstr. 34, D-3000 Hannover, F.R. GERMANY.

INNOVATIONS IN METHODOLOGY CONFERENCE

by J. Richard Hackman

Plans are being laid for one or more Division 14 conferences on "Innovations in Methodology for Industrial/Organizational Psychology." On recommendation of the Long Range Planning Committee of the Division, President John Campbell appointed a special committee to generate ideas and plans for a conference on the topic.

In its first meeting this fall the conference committee decided not to construct a traditional academic conference, in which formal papers are written, read, and discussed. Instead, conference activities will focus on generating, testing and disseminating *educational materials* that can be used by I/O psychologists to add some innovative tools to their methodological kit — or to the kits of their graduate students.

In the first phase of the proposed conference activities, a small group of participants will put together materials (such as papers, workshops, simulations, cases, and so on) that may be useful in helping others learn about innovative methodologies. Then, in the second phase, these materials will be tested and revised by participants in a larger conference. Eventually, the best of the materials will be fine-tuned and made available to all division members.

Numerous specific topics are being considered for the initial conference activities. Examples include: innovative ways of collecting and analyzing qualitative data; innovations in the analysis of evidence; new quantitative techniques for I/O research; innovative strategies for conducting research in politicized organizational settings; methodological innovations from other disciplines; and about a dozen others.

The committee presently is seeking funds to support the proposed conference activities, and it is hoped that the first phase can be carried out during the 1978-79 academic year.

More details about the conference plans (including a detailed description of all conference topics now under consideration) can be obtained from any member of the planning committee. Committee members also seek ideas for additional topics, comments on the tentative conference plans, and expressions of interest from I/O psychologists who would like to become involved in the project. Members are: Tom Bouchard, Richard Hackman (chair), Joel Moses, Barry Staw, Vic Vroom, and Karl Weick.

ANNOUNCEMENT

If you are planning to use a book advertised in **TIP** either in the classroom or for personal use, let the publisher know you saw the advertisement in **TIP**. A short note from a lot of people could greatly enhance **TIP**'s advertising revenue.

POSITION OPENINGS

by Barb

General Electric Lighting Business Group is seeking to add an experienced industrial psychologist to its Professional Relations and Organizational Planning staff. Job responsibilities will include the development and validation of selection test batteries, development of managerial development programs, assessment of employee attitudes and organizational climate and internal consulting assignments. Applicants must have a Ph.D., preferably in I/O Psychology, with two or more years of industrial experience. Statistical competence required. Prefer candidates who also have interest in becoming involved in OD activities. Send resume to:

Jim S. Riddle, Manager, Technical Recruiting and Placement,
General Electric Lighting Business Group, Nela Park,
Cleveland, Ohio 44112.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY: Department of Psychology has a September, 1979 opening for an established I/O Psychologist with an active research program. Responsibilities include supervision of Ph.D. students, graduate and undergraduate teaching. Send curriculum vita to **DR. SHELDON ALEXANDER, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY, DETROIT, MI 48202.** An Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action Employer.

JAMES F. SMITH AND ASSOCIATES: Northeastern management consulting company with some specialization in compensation consulting is seeking several staff and field consultants. Knowledge about compensation is highly desirable. Experience in performance appraisal, training and development, man power and organizational planning and other aspects of human resource utilization is important. M.S. or M.B.A. degree may be acceptable, but Ph.D. or D.B.A. is preferred. Compensation is \$25,000-\$35,000 plus a bonus of 20%-30% of the base salary. Send resume to **DR. JAMES F. SMITH, SUITE 313, 3384 PEACHTREE ROAD, N.E., ATLANTA, GA, 30326.**

RALPH M. PARSONS CO.: Initiating a Human Resources Development Program, has an opening for an I/O Psychologist, whose duties would include operating a Supervisory Development Center, developing in-house training requirements, improving existing performance evaluation methods, and developing program tracking methods. M.S. or Ph.D. in Psychology required, with an emphasis in I/O, and background in Assessment Center Technology. Qualified applicants should submit a resume to **BARBARA L. EVANS, COLLEGE RELATIONS MANAGER, THE RALPH M. PARSONS COMPANY, 100 W. WALNUT STREET, PASADENA, CA. 91124.**

DEVELOPMENT DIMENSIONS INTERNATIONAL: seeks a consultant for the Pittsburgh area to develop, implement, and apply innovative training, assessment and selection concepts for both first-line supervisors and managers in business and government organizations. Implement programs, train trainers and assessment center administrators, and conduct research in the effectiveness of programs. 30% travel. Ph.D. preferred. Write **Development Dimensions International** at 250 Mt. Lebanon Boulevard, Suite 303, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15234. Development Dimensions is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

FUNDAMENTALS OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR: AN APPLIED PERSPECTIVE, 2nd Edition

By **Andrew J. DuBRIN, Rochester Institute of Technology**

Incorporating suggestions stemming from the opinions of instructors, reviewers and students using the first edition, each chapter now begins with a set of learning objectives, contains a list of suggested readings, and includes case incidents illustrating one of the major themes presented in the chapter. The second edition has not abandoned the style which made the original text a success with students and professors. It still is one of the few management texts that offers entire chapters on such topics as political maneuvering ("office politics") and the stresses faced by managerial and professional personnel. Professor DuBrin has revised this book to meet the needs of today's courses in behavioral science in management, organizational behavior, introduction to management, and human relations.

INSTRUCTOR'S MANUAL AVAILABLE ON REQUEST

500 pp. (approx.)	1978	0 08 022251-x	1	\$ 9.50 (approx.)
		0 08 022252-8	h	\$17.50 (approx.)

CASEBOOK OF ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR

By **Andrew J. DuBRIN, Rochester Institute of Technology**

Featuring original cases from a diversity of work organizations, this volume contains an introductory chapter on the use of the case method, including learning objectives. The book is organized around 12 major topics in organizational behavior and includes a comprehensive annotated bibliography. It is designed for courses in organizational behavior, behavior science in management, human relations, personnel administration and industrial psychology.

NEW INSTRUCTOR'S MANUAL AVAILABLE ON REQUEST

326 pp.	1977	0 08 020502-x	1	\$ 7.50
		0 08 020503-8	h	\$14.50

APPLYING THE ASSESSMENT CENTER METHOD

Edited by **Joseph L. MOSES,**

American Telephone & Telegraph, and

WILLIAM C. BYHAM, President, Development Dimensions, Inc.

This professional handbook enables human resources managers in government and industry, as well as industrial psychologists, to solve the critical management staffing problems faced by every organization. Describing current assessment practices and uses, this book offers contributions from active professionals who have either researched or implemented this method. Specific examples and applications of the technique are described, offering a valuable reference for practicing professionals, and students of industrial and organizational psychology.

321 pp.	1977	0 08 019581-4	h	\$20.00
---------	------	---------------	---	---------



PERGAMON PRESS, INC. Maxwell House, Fairview Park, Elmsford, N.Y. 10523
PERGAMON OF CANADA, LTD. 75 The East Mall, Toronto, Ontario M8Z 5W3
PERGAMON PRESS, LTD. Headington Hill Hall, Oxford OX3 0BW, England